



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to be able to give the opinion of the Court of Appeals. The District Judge having declined to issue the writ, Mr. Chanler has appealed and the matter is now pending in the Court of Appeals.

Jurisdiction of Offense Committed on Federal Property.—In *United States v. Battle*, 154 Federal Reporter, 540, Judge Speer, of the United States Circuit Court, Western District of Georgia, Southern Division, held that a crime committed on ground acquired by the United States, and ceded to it by the state of Georgia for the purpose of a federal building, was within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States Courts. He held that the state has authority to cede the ground to the United States, and where it does so the only power which can exercise jurisdiction over such territory to punish crimes committed thereon is the United States, even though the state has restrained the right to exercise its process on the territory ceded.

Liability of Applicant for Receiver for a Deficiency.—In the recent unreported case of *Atlantic Trust Co. v. Chaplin, Receiver*, it was held, by the supreme court of the United States, in an opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Harlan, that a complainant who has in good faith prosecuted a suit upon a good cause of action, and upon whose application the court has properly appointed a receiver, and who obtains a decree fully establishing his rights, is not personally responsible for a deficiency caused by a failure of the property which is the subject of the suit to bring enough to cover the allowances made by the court to the receiver. They adopted the language and the reasoning of the supreme court of Oregon in *Farmers' Loan Co. v. Railroad Co.*, 31 Oregon 237, and refused to follow the various rulings to the contrary in the other states.

The Protection of a Fiduciary in Settlement of Estate by Order of Court.—In the case of *Carter's Administrator v. Skillman, etc.*, decided March 12th, 1908, II Va. Appeals 3, our Supreme Court has rendered a decision which, whilst of first intention, is of great importance and must commend itself to the profession. In this case an administrator settled his accounts *ex parte*, which settlement was duly confirmed. Subsequently after proper publication and posting, and under the usual order of the county court, the entire estate was paid over to the only known distributee, without refunding bond. Nine years afterwards a bill was filed setting up the fact that there were other distributees and the circuit court held that the administrator was not protected by the order of the court in making payment to the only known distributee, and decreed against him. On his appeal the Supreme Court held, in an able opinion by Keith, P., that this order protected him against all parties. A very interesting history of the legislation on this subject is given in the opinion and the conclusion is amply justified in the learned opinion of the court.